

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

BROOKE CARDOZA, et al.,  
 Plaintiff(s),

vs.

BLOOMIN' BRANDS, INC., et al.,  
 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:13-cv-1820-JAD-NJK

ORDER DENYING AS MOOT  
 EMERGENCY MOTION FOR  
 CLARIFICATION  
 (Docket No. 174)

On December 9, 2014, the Court held a hearing on the parties' competing discovery plans. Docket No. 165. The Court ordered the parties to file a joint proposed discovery plan in accordance with the guidelines provided. *See id.*

Now pending before the Court is an emergency motion filed by Plaintiffs attaching competing discovery plans based on the parties' differing interpretation of the Court's ruling at the previous hearing. Docket No. 174.<sup>1</sup> Having reviewed the attached discovery plans submitted, the Court agrees with (and will separately enter) the proposed discovery plan submitted by Plaintiffs.

//

---

<sup>1</sup> Counsel had also telephoned chambers seeking clarification. The Court advises counsel that calling chambers is permissible in only the most urgent situations in which the parties do not have sufficient time to submit a written request for relief. *See* Local Rule 26-7. That was not the situation here. In similar situations in the future, counsel should file a written request in the first instance rather than calling chambers.

1 Accordingly, the pending emergency motion for clarification is hereby **DENIED** as moot.

2 IT IS SO ORDERED.

3 DATED: December 18, 2014

4  
5   
6 NANCY J. KOPPE  
7 United States Magistrate Judge  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28